

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WENDELL COLEMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

NAPA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-04751-SI](#)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Re: Dkt. No. 25


On December 23, 2019, mail that had been sent from the court to plaintiff at the address he provided to the court was returned undelivered, bearing a stamp that stated “return to sender – not deliverable as addressed.” Docket No. 24. Plaintiff has not updated his address and more than sixty days have passed since the mail was first returned to the court undelivered. Plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 3-11(a) which requires a party proceeding *pro se* to “promptly file with the court and serve upon all opposing parties a Notice of Change of Address specifying the new address” when his address changes. Local Rule 3-11(b) allows the court to dismiss a complaint without prejudice when mail directed to a *pro se* party is returned as not deliverable and the *pro se* party fails to send written notice of his current address within sixty days of the return of the undelivered mail. This action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice because plaintiff failed to keep the court informed of his address in compliance with Local Rule 3-11(a).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Having dismissed the action due to plaintiff’s failure to keep the court informed of his current address, the court DISMISSES as moot defendants’ motion for summary judgment based on plaintiff’s failure to exhaust administrative remedies. Docket No. 25.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 3, 2020



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge